Creating Space for Adjunct Faculty: The Multiple Roles of Centers for Teaching and Learning

Kathryn E. Linder
Suffolk University

This article addresses the dovetailing of two higher education changes impacting CTLs: the growing population of adjunct instructors and the increasing responsibility of CTLs to take on organizational development roles. Based on data collected through a needs assessment at a mid-sized, urban, commuter college campus, the author suggests five areas through which CTLs can reconfigure existing spaces to be more inclusive of adjuncts. She argues that by reconfiguring spaces of teaching and learning, CTLs can move beyond a focus on individual instructor support and begin to play a role in organizational development at the institutional level.

Introduction

Recent scholarship has shown that adjunct faculty members have different teaching support needs than their full-time or tenure-track faculty peers (Fagen-Wilen, Springer, Ambrosino, & White, 2006; Ginsberg, 2011; Kezar & Sam, 2010; Nutting, 2003; Thedwall, 2008). Because adjunct faculty may come to academia as highly trained professionals still working in other fields, as aspiring academics, or as retired professionals, these part-time instructors often have highly diverse teaching support needs within their population as well. At Suffolk University, an urban, commuter school located in Boston, our adjunct population continues to grow. Like many other centers for teaching and learning at universities in the United States (see, for example, Hutti, Rhodes, Allison, and Lauterbach 2007; Lambert and Cox 2007), the Center for Teaching Excellence at Suffolk has been

working to expand teaching support programming to meet the needs of the wide range of experience that adjunct faculty bring to their positions as part-time instructors.

The recent increase in literature on adjunct faculty concerns (American Federation of Teachers, 2010; Ginsberg, 2011; Landrum, 2008; Lyons, 2007; Kezar & Sam, 2010; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010; Wallin, 2007) led the staff at our teaching center to consider the ways in which our center can help not only to support adjunct faculty in their positions as teachers, but also to help them continue their professional development within the academy in other ways. In the United States, adjuncts (also referred to as contingent or part-time faculty, lecturers, or instructors) now comprise almost half of all faculty at colleges and universities (American Federation of Teachers, 2010; see also Gappa, 2008). One quarter of this group works in four-year private institutions such as Suffolk (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). The increase in literature on adjunct faculty concerns, however, is focused primarily on community college settings, with there being a "dearth of empirical scholarship on the experience of part-time faculty members at four-year institutions" (Meixner et al., 2010, p. 142). Indeed, Kezar and Sam (2010) call for "more research that documents context-based solutions to address the concerns and issues of non-tenure-track faculty" (p. 114). Thus, this article is meant to build on the adjunct support literature for four-year institutions by describing the mechanisms used to identify and prioritize areas of teaching support, the structures implemented for programming, and the potential roles that CTLs can play when providing adjunct support at four-year institutions.

Additionally, this article addresses the dovetailing of two changes in higher education that are impacting CTLs: the growing population of adjunct instructor support needs and the increasing responsibility of CTLs to take on organizational development roles. In her recent book, *Coming in From the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change* (2011), Schroeder writes to a population of faculty developers "who may feel marginalized from larger-scale initiatives but want to test the waters of institutional change" (p. 3). Similarly, this article recognizes that the changes in higher education resulting from an increasing adjunct faculty population offer an opportunity for CTLs to enter into an organizational development arena, perhaps for the first time, through "partnership, leadership, and collaboration . . . to impact beyond the workshop, individual faculty, teaching assistant (TA), or department levels" (Schroeder, 2011, p. 2). This article illustrates how CTLs, through the act of creating a network of inclusive spaces for adjunct faculty in their campus teaching community, can move beyond a focus on individual

instructor support and begin to play a role in organizational development at the institutional level.

Adjunct Support Planning at a Small CTL

The growing population of adjuncts, as well as an increase in requests for adjunct faculty programming across our university, influenced our decision to add adjunct faculty teaching support to our teaching center's most recent strategic plan. Although our services (such as teaching workshops, individual consultations, midterm feedback gathering sessions, and other teaching and learning events) have always been open and available to adjunct faculty at our university, our staff found that there was some confusion about what events and activities adjuncts could attend. Through new programming and resources specifically targeting the teaching support needs of adjunct faculty, we hoped to address this confusion and help adjuncts to feel comfortable in the spaces that our teaching center creates for conversations around teaching and learning.

Scholars have noted a lack of institutional and teaching support for adjuncts (Jacobe, 2006; Meixner et al., 2010; Thompson, 2003) and have recommended that adjunct faculty receive support tailored to their specific teaching needs and development (Ellison, 2002; Wallin, 2007). Because we are a small center with only three staff members, we conducted a needs assessment to help us prioritize which services and programming we should immediately make available to our adjunct faculty population and what we should include in our more long-term planning to grow this area of support. Based on data collected from over 120 adjunct faculty members at Suffolk University, we identified six possible areas through which our center could reconfigure our space for the inclusion of adjunct faculty members. In a discussion of the steps taken in response to the needs assessment, I articulate how these support areas also imply particular roles that centers for teaching and learning can explore further in their attempts better to integrate adjunct faculty within their local teaching communities in ways that are mindful of institutional needs.

Needs Assessment Methods and Questions

In January 2011, we asked adjunct faculty (who are called "part-time lecturers" at Suffolk based on their union contract) who were either currently teaching or who had previously taught at our institution to complete an anonymous needs assessment survey (see the Appendix). We administered this survey online through Survey Monkey via a link sent to an

adjunct e-mail list. The introduction to the survey alerted participants to our desire to increase adjunct faculty programming and also told them about the possibility of a larger research project developing from the data that they provided. We also informed all survey participants that their survey responses would be used anonymously. In a month's time, 155 adjunct faculty (33%) had answered some survey questions, and 122 of that group had fully completed the survey (a 26% response rate).

Kezar and Sam (2010) have noted the difficulties of collecting data on adjunct faculty. Specifically, they state that "at the institutional level . . . the statistics and data change so rapidly that it is difficult for institutional research offices to sort out how many and what type of non-tenure-track faculty are hired" (p. 10). Certainly, one of the challenges of surveying an adjunct population involves compiling contact information for current and recent part-time instructors who often use e-mail addresses different from those assigned by the university. It is often unclear which adjuncts are currently "active" at the institution because they may teach only one semester a year, or one semester every couple of years, rather than consecutively. For this needs assessment, we collected adjunct contact information from administrative assistants in each of Suffolk's three colleges. The lists they compiled included both current and past adjunct instructors at the university. Based on the survey responses, it became clear that the majority of respondents are current instructors at our institution.

The population of respondents led us to make some hypotheses regarding the limitations of our data: (1) Some of the population who received our needs assessment survey invitation may no longer be teaching at our institution and, thus, are less interested in providing information regarding teaching support at our institution, thus affecting our response rate; (2) if e-mailed during a non-teaching semester, some adjuncts still affiliated with our institution may not have received the invitation to the survey or may have been less inclined to participate because they were not actively on campus; and (3) because of these limitations, creating several opportunities for feedback regarding adjunct programming and support is a crucial component of teaching center engagement with adjunct faculty (this is discussed in more detail below).

For this article, only data from completed surveys were analyzed to learn more about adjunct teaching experiences as well as to collect ideas for how to improve professional development for their population. The survey respondents represented a diverse range of experience; respondents had taught in higher education from less than six months to over 40 years (see Table 1).

Because of our university's professional programs, as well as our loca-

Table 1	
Years of Experience in Higher Education	
Number of Years in Higher Education	*Percentage of Respondents*
0-1 year	9%
2-4 years	24%
5-8 years	20%
9-15 years	22%
16-20 years	12%
More than 20 years	13%

tion in an urban setting, we believed our main adjunct population to be working professionals, and the results of the survey confirmed this. Using categories outlined by Gappa and Leslie in *The Invisible Faculty* (1993), we asked respondents to identify themselves as "specialist, expert, or professional," "freelancer," "career ender," or "aspiring academic." Of the 122 respondents to our survey, 77 (a little over 50%) identified as "specialist, expert or professional" (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). The next highest group of respondents was "career-ender," instructors who are retired or nearly retired and who teach both for enjoyment and to make additional income. The two smallest groups within our adjunct respondents were "freelancer," instructors who teach in addition to having other part-time jobs, and "aspiring academic," those who identified as people teaching part-time as a way to build their CV with the eventual goal of gaining full-time employment at a college or university. This question also had the option of an "other" category, which 16 respondents chose. Of these 16, six indicated that they were graduate students, and several respondents indicated that they were "between identities," with one person offering the example of having been an "aspiring academic" at one time, but since then having given up on the search for a full-time academic position and now considering himself or herself to be a "career ender" (see Table 2).

A main goal of our needs assessment was to learn the most convenient times for adjunct faculty to attend teaching support programming. We hypothesized that many could attend only evening or weekend programs, but this was not the case. Overall, adjunct respondents did show a preference for early and late evening events and activities, but a significant number (almost 50%) also expressed a preference for late morning or midday programs that they might attend on their lunch hour. The day

Table 2
Lifestyles and Reasons for Teaching

Please check the profile that best explains your lifestyle and reasons for teaching:

Profile	Percentage of Respondents
Specialist, Expert or Professional	58%
Career Ender	28%
Freelancer	14%
Aspiring Academic	13%
Other	11%

Note. Because respondents could check more than one box, percentages add up to greater than 100%.

most preferred for programs was Wednesday, something that makes sense for adjunct faculty who may be commuting from outside the Boston area or who come to campus only in the middle of the week. About 20% of respondents indicated that weekend programs would be most convenient, but they were outweighed by those who preferred weekdays (Monday through Friday preferences ranged from 30-50%). It was not surprising that many of the adjunct instructors who responded to the needs assessment mentioned their inability to attend programming because of lack of time. As one responder commented in the needs assessment, "The challenge is that I have a full-time job, and finding time for these activities, while desired, is very difficult."

We also wanted to gather data from adjunct faculty about their preferred formats for programs (see Table 3) and the topics that they believed to be most relevant to their professional development (see Table 4). Adjunct faculty indicated that they were most interested in programming very focused on their individual contexts. For example, department-based workshops, individual consultations, and midterm feedback gathering for individual courses all had high respondent rates. Other areas of interest included facilitated discussions with other adjunct and full-time faculty members on teaching issues and an adjunct newsletter. We were surprised that the respondents to the survey expressed the least amount of interest in activities that we considered to be "community building" programs, such as a learning community, a book group, mentoring, or monthly social gatherings. We hypothesize that this lack of interest may be because of the perceived

Table 3
Levels of Interest in a Variety of Professional Development Venues

Please indicate your interest in participating in any of the following venues to talk about teaching (rated on a 5-point scale from *Not Interested* to *Definitely Interested*):

Least Interested

- Learning community
- Brown-bag lunches
- Evening workshop/book group
- Mentoring to/from another adjunct instructor
- Monthly social gathering

Most Interested

- Department-based workshop
- Roundtable discussions
- Individual consultation on teaching
- Mid-course feedback
- Adjunct newsletter

time involved in each of these activities or because our adjunct population is made up primarily of specialists and career enders who may have extensive networks already in place through their professional communities.

We divided into six categories the potential teaching topics included in our survey: student learning, technology, teaching strategies, professional development, evaluation, and classroom structure. The highest-rated topic of interest to respondents was "evaluating and documenting teaching effectiveness," with 65% indicating their interest in this topic. We surmise that this topic may be of particular interest to adjunct faculty for two reasons. First, our adjunct faculty are dedicated to their students' learning and often express concern about their lack of training as teachers when they attend teaching and learning events offered through our center. The ability to evaluate and measure teaching effectiveness can offer opportunities for an adjunct instructor to increase his or her teaching skills in desired areas. Second, many of our adjuncts are re-hired on a semester-to-semester basis depending on their effectiveness in the classroom. Being able to provide evidence of their teaching strengths in addition to end-of-the-term evaluations may increase the likelihood of being re-hired. Overall, the three top categories of interest were student learning, technology, and classroom structure, with several instructors expanding on their technology needs in the comments area of the question.

Through the survey, we learned there was a lack of training for adjunct faculty in the use of classroom technologies. Although the majority of re-

Table 4
Topics of Most Interest by Percentage of Respondents

Topic	*Percentage*
Evaluating and documenting teaching effectiveness	65%
Making the most of technology	62%
Blackboard technology	59%
Establishing and maintaining a positive classroom environment	58%
Course design	56%
Learning theories: How students learn	56%
Teaching to different learning styles	55%
Web resources for faculty	54%
Active learning	51%
Motivating students	51%
Engaging quiet students	50%
Grading practices	50%
Classroom assessment	49%

Note. Because respondents could check more than one box, percentages add up to greater than 100%.

spondents (95%) teach face-to-face courses, they frequently commented on their interest in learning more about technology, the relationship between technology and learning, and the logistics of implementing new technologies into their classrooms. Some sample comments included the following:

> I would love to update my teaching skills and techniques, especially improve my high tech knowledge, blackboard and online teaching tools !!!

> I have found it difficult to learn Blackboard, or go to the training sessions; perhaps they could be done more frequently?

> Using technology in the classroom IN the classroom. Have adjuncts bring their problems or challenges—that would actually be remedied during the Program would be extremely helpful.

> Mostly, I am interested in classroom technology. I am using Blackboard this semester for assignments and grades, but I feel like I didn't have much help and have learned it mostly on my own.

> I am a very experienced teacher and educator and therefore have taught and/or evaluated most of the topics raised in this questionnaire [sic]. However, I could use more information/instruction on how to use the specific technology in my assigned classrooms at Suffolk University.

> I think a refresher on how to best integrate technology into class and what types of technology work best would be helpful.

These responses are similar to a study conducted by Meixner et al. (2010) at a mid-sized undergraduate university in which adjunct respondents indicated that "general and specific technology assistance" was one of their highest support needs (p. 146). Moreover, Baldwin (1998) has identified technology support and training as one of the key areas that can "exaggerate status differences" between full-time and adjunct faculty (p. 18). Increased use of technology in the classroom means that instructors of all ranks must be trained not only in the technological tools, but also in the skills needed to "integrate technology into the teaching-learning process and to facilitate the individualized, active, and collaborative learning strategies that new technologies can promote" (Baldwin, 1998, p. 10). Baldwin further argues that "higher education institutions must ensure that contingent faculty, along with their permanent colleagues, receive appropriate professional development support [in order to] keep pace with new technological applications" (p. 18). Based on the responses from our needs assessment, it is evident that adjunct faculty are having trouble receiving both basic technology training as well as the corresponding pedagogical training that is recommended.

The Center for Teaching Excellence had already established strong relationships with the academic technologists and information technology support services staff at our university. We co-host an annual technology symposium where faculty can showcase their innovative uses of technology in the classroom. This collaborative venture meant that partnerships were already in place between our center and other stakeholders at the university who have an interest in the technology training and skill development of our instructors. Through our needs assessment data, we

established "a place at the table," a metaphor that Chism (2011) uses to describe "those activities that influence the decisions surrounding the teaching and learning and conditions of faculty work as well as the work itself" (p. 49) at the institutional level. It is important to note that our data allowed us to join an ongoing university-wide conversation among various stakeholders regarding technology training and support needs for instructors. Ultimately, our participation in this conversation at an institutional level directed us to collaborative strategies for how to respond to training needs as well as stronger relationships with partners who would help us create trainings and other methods of support.

"Creating Space" as a Form of Organizational Development

As Schroeder (2011) argues, the "nearly exclusive focus on instructional development by [CTLs] to enact change is largely based on one model of organizational change" (p. 2). By focusing solely on working with individuals through programming, consultation, and resource provision, Schroeder claims that CTLs can miss out on opportunities for larger-scale change that can occur when faculty developers are "held accountable and relied upon for an institutional leadership role" (Schroeder, 2011, p. 8). As described above, adjunct teaching support is one arena through which CTLs may want to become involved in institutional-level change on their campuses through finding a place at the table and contributing to policy-making regarding adjuncts. Instead of merely offering *support* (although important), CTLs may also want to provide *leadership* on a university-wide level.

The metaphor of "creating space" for adjunct faculty referenced throughout this article refers to both the literal spaces that our full-time faculty inhabit on our campuses (for example, faculty lounges, cafeterias, or teaching commons; teaching and learning professional development events; office space; departmental meetings; library access; campus events on teaching such as convocation, speaker events, and trainings) as well as figurative spaces (for example, conversations about teaching and learning; conversations about governance; e-mail lists for faculty and departments; websites where teaching and learning resources are located; professional development funding opportunities; campus newsletters and publications) where adjuncts are often excluded. Because of the continuing growth of the adjunct population, a negotiation of teaching and learning spaces may involve a reconfiguration of our current set-ups.

Changes in our understandings of teaching and learning spaces often

occur parallel to difficult conversations about the role of faculty versus adjuncts. Indeed, arguments about what instructors of different ranks need versus what they desire in terms of space and resources, opinions about compensation for teaching tasks and responsibilities, and claims made about who holds the power within an institution can all be brought to the forefront of these discussions. CTLs can be at the center of these conversations and can provide guidance as to how campus administrators and other stakeholders can best accommodate a growing adjunct population. Through "creating space" in programming, web pages, physical space, and other areas, CTLs also can act as leaders in making sure that adjuncts are acknowledged, are adequately trained alongside their full-time faculty counterparts, and are included in previous exclusionary campus spaces.

The five roles for CTLs outlined below offer a foundation for the support of adjunct faculty and represent a spectrum through which all CTLs can contribute to organizational development around a variety of social, professional, and logistical needs of adjunct faculty populations on our campuses. By embracing these roles, we can offer not only teaching support, but also institutional leadership.

Multiple Roles for CTLs in Adjunct Faculty Support

The needs assessment responses confirmed our hypothesis based on the faculty development literature that adjuncts have a wide variety of professional development needs (see, for example, Fagen-Wilen et al., 2006; Ginsberg, 2011; Kezar and Sam, 2010). We were also able to identify multiple roles available to our Center for Teaching Excellence as we increase our support for adjunct faculty and our institutional leadership capacities (see Table 5). This led us to believe that centers for teaching and learning more broadly should also reflect on the multiple roles available to them when creating space for adjunct faculty as opportunities to practice organizational development.

Based on the information from the needs assessment, our center decided to create space for adjunct faculty at our institution in six main areas: programming, physical space, community development, leadership, our website, and our resource library. We identified and categorized these areas based on two main criteria: (1) the frequency of comments offered throughout the needs assessment in each area and (2) our previous experience observing and hearing about adjuncts' experiences in these areas. Some areas, such as the need for more online resources on our website or the need for a physical space for adjuncts, were relatively easy to identify across several comments. Other areas, such as leadership, were less

Table 5
CTL Potential Roles

Potential Role	*Areas for Change*	*Sample Adjunct Faculty Comments*
Greeter/Welcome Wagon	Community Development	"Is there any introduction given to new part-time faculty aside from the reception?"
Facilitator of/Ally for Teaching Development	Programming	"As suggested by the questionnaire, roundtable discussions of teaching strategies and teaching philosophy, with an eye to integrating teaching modalities and frameworks in various ways." "I would welcome the opportunity to talk to others about developing a syllabus; class plan; grading; and use of technology." "Open discussions regarding teaching challenges are always beneficial."
Liaison	Leadership	"While taking another survey last year, it occurred to me how little I know about other issues about Suffolk such as high-level priorities and budgeting. I'm sure information is available somewhere, but a briefing on topics like this would be nice as part of meetings about teaching included in this survey."
Advocate	Physical Space	"Having an office for Adjunct Professors on campus, in the classroom building." "[We] need to find a way to include adjunct[s] as part of the mix and not on the outside looking in."
Resource Provider	Website/Resources	"Online tools might be helpful!" "On-line website for part-time faculty." "Best Practices Document."

frequently commented on, but noted by our staff as an important growth and development opportunity for adjunct faculty. Each of the areas we identified for the creation of a more inclusive space for the adjunct population were then aligned with the roles that adjunct faculty outlined in their comments (see Table 5). In expanding each of these areas to create a specific space, whether literal or figurative, for adjunct faculty members, we hope to illustrate to adjunct faculty members that we care about their success at our university. Below, I expand on specific components in each of the areas we identified for change.

Community Development

Rationale: By developing a network of adjunct faculty, newcomers to the institution can be introduced to an already-established community where they can receive teaching support tailored to their needs and interests.

Although less of a priority than we originally hypothesized, one component that came out of the needs assessment responses was a desire for community development among adjunct faculty. Because we are a commuter university with no dedicated physical space for adjunct faculty, it is difficult for these faculty to meet and network with one another. In order to foster this kind of community development, our center decided to include a social event for adjuncts as part of our regular semester calendar. Hosted in the early evening, this event will offer adjunct faculty the chance to socialize with their peers both in and outside of their departments. In addition to offering a physical space for networking, it is our hope that these events also will illustrate to adjunct faculty that we value them as members of the university community.

Another area in which our center chose to respond to adjunct faculty requests for community development was through the creation of a part-time faculty newsletter edition that supplements our general semester newsletter for the campus community. Based on needs assessment feedback, over 80% of adjuncts indicated some level of interest in a newsletter written specifically to address their teaching needs. Almost one quarter of responders (28 individuals) were "very" or "definitely" interested in a newsletter. Each part-time newsletter edition created by the center includes a faculty profile of an adjunct instructor with a picture, a book review of a text written specifically to an adjunct audience, a main article on a teaching issue written by a part-time lecturer, and event invitations to the various activities on our calendar for the upcoming semester.

The response to the newsletter has been positive, but the center faces

challenges in making sure that adjunct faculty members know that this new resource is available. Our most recent end-of-the-year programming survey, which asks participants in center activities whether they have read our most recent newsletter or the adjunct edition of the newsletter indicated that some adjuncts remain unaware that the newsletter exists. Because both newsletter editions are relatively new (the general newsletter was first published in spring 2010 and the adjunct newsletter in spring 2011) and are published only digitally on our teaching center website, we believe that increased marketing is needed for both newsletters. As we increase marketing for other adjunct-related events and activities, we also hope that the readership of the newsletter will grow.

Programming

Rationale: By developing new programming that is specifically geared toward the needs of adjunct faculty, they can feel more included in the university teaching community.

Adjunct faculty are invited to participate in all Center for Teaching Excellence events and activities through our regular marketing techniques, which include e-mail advertisements and reminders as well as postings to our university website calendar. Despite these invitations, however, adjunct faculty at our institution have expressed confusion about whether they are allowed to take part in all aspects of our programming. In response to this confusion, we began to develop programming based on the needs expressed in our adjunct lecturer needs assessment. Although this programming is open to all, we now specifically market it to our adjunct faculty e-mail list and include expanded descriptions of these programs in our part-time lecturer newsletter edition. Most importantly, we recruit adjunct instructors to facilitate some of these programs within our center so that these instructors can become more visible both to their adjunct peers and to the full-time faculty in their departments and across the university.

In the semester when our needs assessment was conducted, we hosted two adjunct workshops with three scheduled for Fall 2011. Based on the needs assessment data, we are also in the process of developing a series of workshops that will run each semester on how to use classroom technology, specifically, the classroom management tool Blackboard. The adjunct instructors at our university expressed in the needs assessment that they find it difficult to receive technology training because of their schedules; many of them noted that they do not even know the basic functions of Blackboard. This new workshop series not only will train instructors on Blackboard 101, but also will explore best practices for using components

such as the discussion boards. In order to help our adjunct instructors know more about the technology support of our institution, these sessions will be facilitated in partnership with academic technologists representing all three of our colleges.

Leadership

Rationale: By offering adjunct faculty leadership roles on our advisory board and as facilitators of programming, they can learn more about the university's governance, mentor their peers, and have a space to voice teaching concerns where they will be heard.

The size of our Center for Teaching Excellence necessitates that we encourage and support faculty-led programming such as book groups, workshops, and discussions. From its inception in 2006, over 50% of the programs on the CTE calendar have been faculty led, with more extensive workshops and events such as course design institutes, writing groups, and campus-wide events facilitated by center staff. We have noticed several benefits to our faculty-led programming, including a wide variety of topics for faculty to participate in, an increase in confidence for faculty members who present on aspects of teaching related to their own experience (several have gone on to present at regional, national, and international teaching and learning conferences), interdisciplinary relationships developed among faculty who meet one another at teaching center events, and, perhaps most importantly, faculty investment in the teaching center. As part of our increase in adjunct-related programming, we wanted to make sure that these benefits were also extended to the adjunct population at our institution.

We began to build a network of adjunct instructors who might be interested in facilitating events in the center by identifying adjunct instructors who are frequent participants in our past events and activities. By targeting these individuals, we knew that we would be working with instructors who were familiar with the kinds of events at the center and who might be more likely to feel comfortable facilitating something for us. As possible adjunct facilitators are identified, they are contacted by the center's director either through an e-mail or handwritten note to broach the topic of possible facilitation. Of three people initially contacted, all agreed to facilitate an event based on the topics generated from the adjunct needs assessment.

Gappa and Leslie (1993) noted that an area of concern for adjunct faculty was their lack of involvement in governance. One of the most

important components of adjunct-facilitated programming is that adjuncts who attend these sessions see their part-time peers in positions of leadership and authority in relationship to teaching at our institution. As some adjunct instructors indicated in their needs assessment responses, they are not always included in faculty conversations on teaching in their home departments. Indeed, the literature indicates that they frequently are alienated from department meetings, committees, and social events (see, for example, Schwartz, 2007). Thus, we believe it is important for adjunct instructors to have an outlet at the institution where they can be leaders in the adjunct community, where they can further their professional development as teachers at the institutional-level, and where they can network and interact with faculty from their departments and from across the university.

An additional outlet for adjunct leadership is our teaching center's advisory board, made up of faculty, staff, and administrators from across our university. This year we invited an adjunct faculty member to be a part of the board to help shape our future programming and support offerings. In the past, our challenge has been whether we can find an adjunct representative who can make a long-term commitment to the board when adjunct teaching assignments are decided on a semester-to-semester basis. Because this problem will not go away in the near future, we chose to make this a yearly rotating position so that we can still benefit from the perspectives and ideas of our adjuncts in a formal way. We chose a representative who is a long-term adjunct at the institution and who has been consistently renewed in her appointment to increase the likelihood that she will remain on our board for the next year. We consider this addition of an adjunct representative to our advisory board a mutually beneficial decision. As we learn from the experience and expertise of our new board member, our adjunct representative will gain experience in administrative planning as well as meet a network of faculty colleagues from across the institution.

Physical Space

Rationale: By offering adjunct faculty a physical space where they can grade papers, meet with students, and eat a meal or snack during down time, the teaching center models ways to offer additional space for adjuncts on campus.

Some of the adjuncts who responded to our needs assessment expressed frustration at their lack of a physical space to hold office hours with

students, grade on campus, or just have a place to go for down time in between classes. The increase in our targeted programming for adjunct instructors had the added benefit of bringing them into our center's dedicated physical space, a place that they are welcome to use for a variety of teaching-related needs. The lounge area in the center's space is equipped with couches and comfortable seating as well as reading materials related to teaching support; the space also includes a large conference table. We make adjunct instructors aware when they attend programming that they are welcome to use to the space to meet with students, grade papers, or socialize with their colleagues. The center also has computers available for all faculty and adjuncts to reserve for use as well as a kitchen area where beverages such as water, coffee, tea, and juice are available.

In order to make sure that adjuncts are aware of this lounge space, in addition to telling them during programming, we have also inserted an advertisement in our part-time newsletter edition to let them know that the space is available. These initiatives appear to have resulted in an increased use of our space by adjunct instructors, especially for grading, although we have not yet officially tried to measure this increase. Adjuncts also come to the space between classes or for a cup of coffee. Because the center space also houses our lending library of teaching books and other media, it is our hope that an increased use of the space by adjunct faculty will also result in an increase in their browsing of the library and checking out of materials. We plan to ask adjunct faculty about their use of the space in an end-of-the-year evaluation of adjunct services.

Website/Resources

Rationale: Emphasizing adjunct faculty resources on our center website and in the materials that we order for our lending library will show adjunct faculty that they can find resources for discussing their teaching concerns specifically and that they are a population that matters at our university.

Our university website marks an additional area where our center is developing space for adjunct instructors. This is a longer-term project through which we continue to add to a webpage with adjunct teaching resources highlighting information that is in our lending library as well as information that is online at other institutions. We also plan to develop a space on our website where adjuncts can find answers to frequently asked questions, such as the location of the campus bookstore or whom they should contact for technology training in their college. The development of these online resources for adjunct faculty is a time-consuming and on-

going project. As the project develops, we hope to involve adjunct faculty in helping to plan the structure of the web pages as well as in finding and developing resource pages.

At the time that our center launched the adjunct needs assessment survey, we also conducted an inventory of our lending library to see what materials we had on hand that were specifically focused on adjuncts' teaching needs. Unfortunately, the answer was "not many." Although our lending library is small, it is important that our center have materials addressing a variety of teaching support needs. The large number of adjunct faculty at our institution indicates that adjuncts are a population deserving their own teaching resources. Adjunct faculty members certainly face some of the same teaching challenges as full-time faculty, and they can use the same resources on topics such as classroom management, course design, and teaching tips. Other areas, however, such as career development, acculturation to new campuses, and the politics of being on the fringes of a department are more specific to the adjunct faculty experience. Adding books to our library written specifically to adjunct audiences and creating a special shelf for these resources is a tangible way that our center chose to demonstrate that we are both aware of, and we care about, the needs of adjunct faculty on our campus.

Future Directions:
CTLs and Organizational Change for Adjunct Faculty

Working with the adjunct faculty at our institution will remain one of our teaching center's strategic goals in the coming years as we continue to explore how our teaching support programs can be expanded and improved upon. As our center continues to develop our adjunct programming and organizational development role in larger institutional conversations, we are beginning to assess the changes we have made. There are several avenues through which we are gathering information from adjunct instructors in order to evaluate whether their teaching support needs are being met. First, we have created program evaluations for adjunct-facilitated workshops that are sent to adjunct participants via e-mail (see the Appendix). These evaluations are focused specifically on how the participants heard about our workshop program, their motivation to attend, and whether they are interested in attending future events. Second, we will be sending out a survey to our adjunct population at the end of the year to gauge their use of the center's physical space, our website, and their readership of the newsletter. After completing the needs assessment, we are committed to keeping the lines of communication open so

that adjunct faculty can provide feedback about whether their needs are being met and how the teaching center can better serve them. Third, the staff at our center are attending adjunct-facilitated workshops in order to meet adjunct instructors who are attending our programs for the first time, ask them about their teaching experiences at our university, and offer them more information about our services. Lastly, as departments and programs at our institution become more familiar with the services that we offer to adjuncts, we are now being approached to help with new adjunct teaching orientations and adjunct faculty meetings. We see these as additional opportunities to strengthen our organizational development role as well as grow our relationships with new and seasoned adjunct faculty that will help us better assess whether our programs are meeting adjuncts' needs.

As our center continues to develop and expand professional development for adjunct faculty, we have found that the inclusion of adjuncts into our university teaching community is important for two additional reasons beyond strengthening the role of our center as an organizational development unit. First, we see benefits for students and faculty. Although some have questioned whether adjunct instructors can offer the same quality of teaching as full-time faculty (see, for example, Umbach, 2007), other studies have illustrated that there is little to no difference in quality (Landrum, 2008). Indeed, the inclusion of adjunct faculty in teaching support initiatives ensures that all instructors are being held accountable to developing their classroom practices and pedagogical strategies. As Thompson (2003) points out in her article "Contingent Faculty and Student Learning: Welcome to the Strativersity," both faculty and students "benefit from teachers who are aware of developing pedagogies, changing disciplines, and new classroom practices and technologies" (p. 43; see also Meixner et al., 2010). By including adjunct faculty as part of a CTL community, universities can work to create a community of teaching excellence that reaches all classrooms regardless of instructor status.

Second, we see the professional development of adjunct faculty as an opportunity to strengthen the university's mission. Adjunct faculty are a population that will continue to grow on university campuses. By developing inclusive practices for all instructors, administrators can better communicate and facilitate the university mission. As Meixner et al. (2010) argue, "given the growing importance of this labor force to the future of universities, it is imperative that we provide them with the institutional support that will enable them to carry out the university's mission in their own classrooms" (p. 147). If adjunct faculty feel disconnected, unsupported, and undervalued, their loyalty to the larger university mission

and objectives will waver. In order to have strong instructor support for strategic goals around teaching and learning, universities must consider how to include the large population of adjunct instructors into their conversations and objectives.

Because of the two reasons cited above, "administrators need to be cognizant of the best ways to integrate [adjunct faculty] into the culture of the institution" (Wallin, 2007, p. 68). This is where CTLs can play a foundational and imperative role. As teaching and learning centers evaluate the position they want to take in the development of adjunct faculty, they have the opportunity to consider moving beyond an instructional development model to an organizational development model. CTLs can provide both support *and* leadership in response to a growing population of adjuncts. Higher education continues to change and evolve as our students become more and more varied, the landscape of online learning grows and develops, and new teaching and learning innovations emerge almost daily. By situating CTLs in organizational development roles, we can ensure that seeking out the best practices of teaching and learning remains a constant in our ever-changing institutions of higher education.

References

American Federation of Teachers. (2010). A National Survey of Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty. *American Academic*, 2, 3-15.

Baldwin, R. G. (1998). Technology's impact on faculty life and work. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 76*, 7-21.

Chism, N. V. N. (2011). Getting to the table: Planning and developing institutional initiatives. In C. Schroeder (Ed.), *Coming in from the margins: Faculty development's emerging organizational development role in institutional change* (pp. 47-59). Sterling, Virginia: Stylus.

Ellison, A. (2002). *The accidental faculty: Adjunct instructors in community colleges*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida.

Fagen-Wilen, R., Springer, D. W., Ambrosino, B., & White, B. W. (2006). The support of adjunct faculty: An academic imperative. *Social Work Education, 25*(1), 39-51.

Gappa, J. M. (2008). Today's majority: Faculty outside the tenure system. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 40*, 50-54.

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ginsberg, S. M. (2011). Support needs of university adjuncts. *To Improve the Academy, 29*, 32-45.

Hutti, M. H., Rhodes, G. S., Allison, J., & Lauterbach, E. (2007). The part-

time faculty institute: Strategically designed and continually assessed. In R. E. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty* (pp. 31-48). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Jacobe, M. F. (2006). Contingent faculty across the disciplines. *Academe*, *92*(6), 43-49.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010). *Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education: Demographics, experience, and plans of action* (ASHE Higher Education Report, Vol. 36, No. 4). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lambert, H. E., & Cox, M. D. (2007). The two-year effort to build a program that provides part-time faculty pedagogical support, community, and a sense of mission. In R. E. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty* (pp. 217-240). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Landrum, R. E. (2008). Are there instructional differences between full-time and part-time faculty? *College Teaching*, *57*(1), 23-26.

Lyons, R. E. (Ed.). (2007). *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Meixner, C., Kruck, S. E., & Madden, L. T. (2010). Inclusion of part-time faculty for the benefit of faculty and students. *College Teaching*, *58*, 141-147.

Nutting, M. M. (2003). Part-time faculty: Why should we care? *New Directions for Higher Education*, *123*, 33-39.

Schroeder, C. M. (2011). Introduction to *Coming in from the margins: Faculty development's emerging organizational development role in institutional change* (pp. 1-13). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Schwartz, J. (2007). Professional development geared to part-timers' needs: An adjunct professor's perspective. In R. E. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty* (pp. 241- 251). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Thedwall, K. (2008). Nontenure-track faculty: Rising numbers, lost opportunities. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *123*, 11-19.

Thompson, K. (2003). Contingent faculty and student learning: Welcome to the strativersity. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *123*, 41-47.

Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education*, *30*(2), 91-123.

Wallin, D. L. (2007). Part-time faculty and professional development: Notes from the field. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 140*, 67-73.

Kathryn E. Linder *is the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence at Suffolk University. She earned her Ph.D. in Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at The Ohio State University. Her research interests include cultural studies of education, academic writing development, and faculty development.*

Appendix
Part-Time Lecturer Teaching Support Survey

Your College/Department:

Your Years of Teaching Experience in Higher Education:

Your Years of Teaching at Suffolk University:

Do you primarily teach (circle one):

Online   Face-to-Face   Both equally

Place a check mark in the blank beside the profile that best explains your lifestyle and reasons for teaching:

— *Specialist, expert, professional*: Employed full-time or nearly full-time outside of teaching at the college; teach part-time primarily as a strategy for sharing expertise with others, making contacts, and generating additional income.

— *Career ender*: Retired or nearing retirement; teaching for personal fulfillment, sharing expertise with students, and generating additional income.

— *Freelancer*: By choice, work several part-time jobs, including teaching, because of the variety and rewards it provides.

— *Aspiring Academic*: Teach part-time as a strategy for gaining a full-time teaching position at the college or university level.

Please check any of the following CTE services that you have utilized in the past:

— Workshop

— Book group

— Guest speaker

— Afternoon tea discussion

— Academic conference

— Spring luncheon

— Individual consultation

— Midterm feedback

— Other (please describe): _____

Using the following scale, please indicate your interest in participating in any of the following venues to talk about teaching:
1 = not interested; 2 = somewhat interested; 3 = interested; 4 = very interested; 5 = definitely interested

— Learning communities

— Department based workshops

— Roundtable discussions

— Individual consultations on teaching

— Brown bag lunches

— Evening workshops

— Mid-course feedback sessions

— Adjunct newsletter

— Mentoring *from* another adjunct instructor

— Becoming a mentor *for* another adjunct instructor

— Evening book group

— Monthly social gathering

— Other (please describe):_____

Please check all the topics that you are interested in learning more about:

— Student learning

— Active learning

— Learning theories: How students learn

— Adult vs. traditional learners: How they differ

— Teaching to different learning styles

— Addressing the issue of students' prior knowledge

— University resources outside of the classroom for students

Technology

— Engaging the online learner

— Blackboard technology

— Web resources for faculty

— Making the most of technology

Appendix (*continued*)
Part-Time Lecturer Teaching Support Survey

Teaching Strategies

— Engaging the quiet student

— Teaching large classes

— Group Dynamics in the Classroom

— Leading effective discussion

— Reading strategies for students

— Planning the first day of class

— Teaching academically diverse students

— Collaborative learning

— Getting your students to do the readings

— Lecturing

— Responding to student incivility in class

— Motivating your students

— Fielding students' questions

— Maintaining instructional quality with limited resources

Professional Development

— Evaluating and documenting teaching effectiveness

— Effective time management

— Making the most of office hours

— Writing letters of recommendation

— Mentoring

Evaluation

— Classroom assessment

— Developing assessment/grading rubrics

— Grading practices

— Responding to student writing

— Test construction

— Academic honesty

Classroom Structure

— Establishing and maintaining a positive classroom environment

— Developing Learning Objectives

— Course design

— Syllabus development

Other (please describe): _____

Please indicate the most convenient *time* for teaching events that you might attend:

— Early evening

— Late evening

— Early morning

— Late morning

— Mid-day

— Weekends

— None of these times are convenient for me

Please indicate the most convenient *day* for teaching events that you might attend:

Monday   Tuesday   Wednesday   Thursday
          Friday   Weekend

Please write any ideas, suggestions, or thoughts that you have regarding programming for adjunct instructors at the Center for Teaching Excellence.

Would you be willing to be contact for a short interview on your teaching needs? Y/N

If yes, please provide your email to be contacted: _____

Appendix (*continued*)
Part-Time Lecturer Teaching Support Survey

Part-Time Lecturer Teaching Support Program Assessment Survey Questions:

You recently attended _____, a support program for part-time instructors at Suffolk University. Please check all of the following that describe your motivation to attend:

— The event was at a convenient time.

— The event was on a topic of interest to me.

— The event would allow me to meet other part-time instructors in my department.

— The event would allow me to meet other part-time instructors outside of my department.

— The event sounded fun.

— A friend/colleague was also attending the event.

— Other: _____

Please check any of the following that apply to your recent attendance at _____ :

— To attend this event, I came from off-campus on a day that I normally would not.

— I signed up in advance for this event

— My attendance at this event was a last-minute decision

— I told at least one colleague about my attendance at this event *before* the event took place

— I told at least one colleague about my attendance at this event *after* the event took place

How would you rate the overall content of _____?

How would you rate the overall facilitation of _____?

How likely are you to attend another teaching support event at CTE (circle one)?

Not at all likely   Somewhat likely   Very likely

What will most impact your attendance at future CTE events?
- If the topic is interesting to me
- If the time and date of the event are convenient to me
- If I will already be on or near campus around the time of the event
- If my department colleagues will also be attending the event
- Other? _____

How did you hear about _____ ?
- Through an email announcement from CTE
- By checking the CTE website calendar
- Through an email announcement from Public Affairs
- From a colleague in my department
- From a colleague outside of my department
- Other (please describe): _____